

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Title is amended as suggested in the Office Action. A new Abstract believed to be in more proper format under United States practice is also submitted.

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1-12 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent 4,549,251 to Chapman et al. (herein "Chapman"). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chapman in view of JP 58-103760 to Kohei. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chapman in view of U.S. patent 5,769,530 to Biro et al. (herein "Biro"). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Chapman in view of U.S. patent 6,515,437 to Zinkler et al. (herein "Zinkler"). Claims 1-9 were noted as allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 13-15 and 17-18 are allowed.

Initially, applicants gratefully acknowledge the early indication of the allowable subject matter in claims 1-9 and the allowance of claims 13-15 and 17-18.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1-12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

The above-noted claims were rejected as confusing as to whether they were directed to a product claim or a process.

By the present amendment each of claims 1-12 and 16 is amended to be more clearly directed to an apparatus of a fluorescent lamp. The presently submitted amendments are believed to address the rejection of claims 1-12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.


Addressing now the above-noted prior art rejections to claims 10-12 and 16, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

Independent claims 10 and 16 are amended by the present response to now be written as dependent claims dependent on independent claim 1. Independent claim 1 was noted as reciting allowable subject matter in the Office Action, and thus claims 10-12 and 16 now dependent on independent claim 1 are also believed to be allowable.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423